

Date: Fri, 11 Jun 93 04:30:20 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #182  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 11 Jun 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 182

Today's Topics:

                    Blind VE flames  
            Buying radios without a license (2 msgs)  
    NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case (2 msgs)  
            VE's Unnecessary?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1993 01:52:10 GMT  
From: swrinde!gatech!asuvax!ennews!enuxva.eas.asu.edu!shandrow@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Blind VE flames  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Well, it is also my contention that this is not a flame war and it is not a  
nonamateur radio issue. Also I think an attempt is being made with this  
to discredit us and "put us in our place." We must not stand for this.

-----  
Date: 10 Jun 1993 14:02:00 -0700  
From: techbook.com!techbook.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Buying radios without a license  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

David Adams (dadams@cray.com) wrote:  
: In article t4b@techbook.techbook.com, genew@techbook.techbook.com (Gene Wolford)  
writes:

: |  
: |Gene "I support ALL of the Constitution" WOLFORD  
: |  
: |The ARRL fights for my radio privileges.  
: |  
: |-----  
: |  
: |The NRA protects my Second Amendment rights!  
: |  
: |^^^^^^  
: |

: I am of the opinion that had radio been around in the 18th Century that  
: the founders would have found a place to protect it in between the first  
: and second ammendments. ;^)

: I personally think that protecting ameteur radio can do more to protect  
: liberty than the second amendment.

Just try to beat off a mugger with that rubber duck! :-}

: (Of course the right to communicate  
: without the right to defend oneself doesn't do much good, and vice versa.)

Exactly!

In short:

Keep your nicads charged and your powder dry!

Gene

--

Those who beat their swords into plowshares  
are destined to plow for those who don't.  
genew@techbook.COM

Please direct flames to: [genew@ucant.gethere.frmhere](mailto:genew@ucant.gethere.frmhere)

-----

Date: 11 Jun 1993 05:15:03 GMT  
From: [usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!haven.umd.edu!ni.umd.edu!sayshell.umd.edu!louie@network.UCSD.EDU](mailto:usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!haven.umd.edu!ni.umd.edu!sayshell.umd.edu!louie@network.UCSD.EDU)  
Subject: Buying radios without a license  
To: [ham-policy@ucsd.edu](mailto:ham-policy@ucsd.edu)

In article <1v87g8\$3m@techbook.techbook.com> genew@techbook.techbook.com (Gene Welford) writes:

>Just try to beat off a mugger with that rubber duck! :-}

Do not underestimate the ability of a Motorola HT-220 to put a dent in your head when wielded by its rubber duck. And afterwards, you can use it to call for assistance.

louie  
wa3ymh

-----  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1993 17:07:28 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!  
cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!anasaz!misty!john@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

]I have to agree with the appellate court here. The 60 foot crank up tower  
]would have been more than adequate, NQ0I's comments about wind notwithstanding.  
]Good quality crankups can be guyed, and are far less of a pain to deal with  
]than those that require you to haul out a climbing belt.

I agree. I wish I could have a 60 foot crankup. I do emergency communications (net control of Hurricane Watch Net) with a 16 feet above the ground tribander on 20 - because of antenna restrictions.

]PRB-1 is being wasted by hams who seem to think that it means that they can  
]build any antenna they want.

Actually, I'm not sure this ruling should be considered a defeat. Sure, the ham was defeated, but his request really was unreasonable. On the other hand, the court seemed willing to use PRB-1 to allow a 35 foot tower or a 60 foot crankup. That would be considered a serious victory in many parts. This may actually set a good precedent in that regard.

--

John Moore NJ7E, 7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253 (602-951-9326)  
john@anasazi.com ncar!noao!asuvax!anasaz!john anasaz!john@asuvax.eas.asu.edu  
Get into Ham Radio today! Morse Code no longer needed! It's a hobby, a sport, a convenience, a technical challenge, a public service. Go rec.radio.amateur.misc

-----

Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1993 11:17:56 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

You guys should have such problems to complain about. In my village, ground mounted towers are limited to 50', can only be placed in back yards, and require 1' of set back for every 1' of height. Well on 1/4 acres lots, it doesn't take a genius to figure out that most lots will allow at most a 25-30' tower.

I'm currently embroiled in a request for a special use permit to place my VHF/UHF antennas back up on my roof because the zoning ordinances only allow 10' above the roof for roof mounted antennas and I'm requesting 20'. The villages attitude in the whole thing is "don't like our ordinances? Sue us." Add to that my self proclaimed "friendly" neighbors that are now spreading petitions around to stop my permit. Seems they're are concerned that RFI interferes with SIDS monitors, 911 calls, baby monitors, you name it.

Until the FCC steps in and says \*ENOUGH\*, it's only going to get worse!

As to whether NQ0I's request was unreasonable or not, who's to judge? The summary of the ruling that was posted certainly isn't going to be worded in such a way as to make NQ0I's request sound reasonable. But in any case, I don't believe it's going to help amateur radio. I wish the ARRL would help fund several "ideal" cases and help put some good case law on the books. Most people don't have the funds to mount a good legal defense and as such, the rulings aren't necessarily in our favor, yet they impact everyone.

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1993 09:19:36 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!torn!nott!bnrgate!bcars267!bnr.ca!  
wdhyte@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: VE's Unnecessary?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Well, I hate coming in in the middle of something but I'm going to anyway being as I am VE over here in Tokyo. This may sound old fashioned and for my 39 (almost 40) years it probably is but I am of the opinion that anything worth having is worth working for. As a result, we (humanity) will tend to be a bit more zealous in the

guarding of something if we think others want it and that in order to receive it, have to demonstrate some level of commitment. So, for VEs, we had to demonstrate our commitment to the hobby and the established process (and the evolution thereof). Why is it therefore unreasonable to think that if someone wants to become a member of the rank and file, that the person(s) allowing them access will also be members of the same group? Am I better qualified to test someone than the clerk/admin/city hall? Of course I am. I've gained an appreciation for the task that they are about to take on. Seems to me there is a lot more to the hobby than just twisting some knobs, cranking up the KW and seeing how much TVI havoc we can wrack within the neighborhood. Liken this to the medical field, or law enforcement, or countless others where you are tested. I certainly feel better knowing that my doctor has had testing from a group other than my mother just because she decided she was qualified to perform the testing herself.

73 de Dave 7J1AIW/WZ1S

-----  
Dave Hyte           wdhyte@bnr.ca    | Time flys like the wind,  
NTJI/BNR Japan       |           Fruit flys like bananas...  
Opinions are mostly my own, not counting the ones I borrowed...  
-----

Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1993 03:06:23 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!crcnis1.unl.edu!  
news.unomaha.edu!nevada.edu!jimi!physics.unr.edu!nimbus!mswmod@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun10.160744.10341@leland.Stanford.EDU>,  
<cole.186.739750617@soldev.tti.com>, <1993Jun10.232329.17773@ncar.ucar.edu>u  
Subject : Re: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case

I too live in a windy area. Will have my tower up before winter.  
Not sure how high...but will be as high as I can afford and that  
will land on my place if it falls.

Other than that, I really don't care what anyone thinks. If you  
own the land, then it's up to you to do what you want. Anything  
else should belong in Hitler's old germany!!

73, Ron, KU7Y

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 93 05:19:40 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!  
umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun10.160744.10341@leland.Stanford.EDU>,  
<cole.186.739750617@soldev.tti.com>, <1993Jun10.232329.17773@ncar.ucar.edu>p  
Subject : Re: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case

In article <1993Jun10.232329.17773@ncar.ucar.edu> elmore@rap.ucar.edu (Kim Elmore) writes:

>The problem started when he applied for a building permit (required)  
>and a County planner \*unilaterally\* and \*without legal sanction\* sent  
>a few dozen flyers to everyone within about a mile of NQ0I's property  
>to see if anyone objected. If you ask enough people, someone is bound  
>to say "Hell no!" That's what the Planner and Council were,  
>evidently, looking for.

Did NQ0I ask his neighbors first, before applying? If not, he really failed to give adequate consideration to the concerns of his neighbors. All it really takes is a visit to the shack during a major natural disaster, especially if one of your neighbors happens to have a relative near the disaster. One converted neighbor can work wonders.

He also failed to get the necessary political jump on the Planning Office that's necessary with \*any\* usage permit. It's a sad state of affairs with regard to property rights in this country, but in any incorporated area, the function of most Planning Commissions is "not to allow anything that would tick someone off". This is reality.

> No, he didn't want an "aluminum forest"; he initially wanted a  
>125' guyed tower and later compromised on an 80' tower.

I'd like to know what the reason for the 125' (or even the 80') tower was. Although the soil in Colorado is relatively poor, this is far less of a concern for horizontal antennas than verticals at HF.

Frankly, if I had that much land, I'd put in a rhombic. It has better aesthetics, better wind survivability, and costs a lot less.

>I'm a research meteorologist and we love to study the winds.

Okay, have a look at the records for Point Reyes, CA, the wind capital of the US. The Coast Guard, AT&T, and MCI all operate coastal marine HF off the point, all with rhombics. (AT&T did a really nice monograph on how to build rhombics, published back in 1941.)

> Finally, whether or not \*any\* of us would want a 100' tower or  
>not is beside the point, as is whether or not NQ0I enjoys DXing,

>contesting, rag-chewing, RTTY, AMTOR, PACTOR, 160 m, CW, fone, or  
>sunny days. It's not our station: it belongs to NQ0I. Whether or not  
>\*I\* think a 125' tower is a reasonable thing to have \*in any case\*  
>isn't the point (I'd love one, BTW). What is at stake here was (is)  
>1) did the County "reasonably accomodate ... with minimal regulation"  
>the legitimate activity of Amateur radio, 2) what does PRB-1 really  
>mean (read the Court's decision: they think it's essentially a waste  
>in that it provides no guidance whatsoever) and, to a lesser extent 3)  
>who's property is it anyway?

You neglected the wording which required a "balance" between local concerns and the federal interest. I fail to see what compromise was made in order to address the aesthetic and property value concerns of the neighborhood.

Finally, the size of the tower \*is\* important to the rest of us. PRB-1 is at best a tenuous requirement that amateur needs be considered. Decisions lost when PRB-1 is invoked hurt us all, and it's especially shameful when such decisions could have been avoided, and particularly shameful when they are not as a result of technical need.

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----  
Date: 10 Jun 1993 23:13:49 -0500  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!doc.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <cole.186.739750617@soldev.tti.com>,  
<1993Jun10.232329.17773@ncar.ucar.edu>, <1993Jun11.030623.18992@physics.unr.edu>  
Subject : Re: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case

In article <1993Jun11.030623.18992@physics.unr.edu> mswmod@nimbus.sage.unr.edu (stark) writes:

>  
>Other than that, I really don't care what anyone thinks. If you  
>own the land, then it's up to you to do what you want. Anything  
>else should belong in Hitler's old germany!!  
>  
>73, Ron, KU7Y  
>  
>

I agree wholeheartedly with this sentiment. As far as I'm concerned if one owns

the land, one can do what one likes with it. If that happens to include erecting a tower (even an extremely high one), then so be it.

This isn't the issue, but I feel that it's a bit ungrateful of some of the public to instigate this sort of thing. If the duties that amateurs do on a voluntary basis were taken over by the government, the costs in the form of higher taxes would be considerable.

73,

--

David Milner | \*\*\*\*\* | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)  
(GeNie) D.MILNER | \* Moo! \* | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu  
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | \*\*\*\*\* | I know who I am, and I will NEVER go back!  
\*\* Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) \*\*

-----

Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1993 01:30:10 GMT  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!enuxva.eas.asu.edu!  
shandrow@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun8.165024.22139@ke4zv.uucp>, <C8DDzH.Au6@ucdavis.edu>,  
<1993Jun10.002147.25377@en.ecn.purdue.edu>  
Subject : Re: blind VEs

Actually, you are absolutely correct about readers. The reader doesn't make those judgements on his/her own. Rather, the blind person gives the reader instructions on what is and isn't permitted in the testing session and if those rules are not followed to the letter the blind person is notified. So, you see, the reader is simply an extension of the blind VE.

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #182  
\*\*\*\*\*